

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending, Claims 1, 6, 10 and 14 having been amended by way of the present amendment. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action Claim 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and Claims 1-19 were rejected as being obvious over Schwoegler (U.S. Patent No. 6,590,529) in view of Densmore (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,305).

In reply Claim 1 has been amended, consistent with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method for streaming dynamic weather content simultaneously to a plurality of end user clients in a wide area communication system. The method includes steps of collecting weather content continuously from a plurality of weather stations positioned in different localities, and receiving a request for dynamic weather content regarding a particular locality from each end user client at predetermined time intervals. The method also includes a step of selecting local weather content to be delivered to each end user client in response to each request, where the local weather content includes data from at least one of the plurality of weather stations in a locality associated with respective requests from each end user client. A selected weather content is then transmitted simultaneously to each end user client.

An advantage of the present invention is that it provides an infrastructure by which dynamic weather content is collected from a plurality of different weather stations positioned in different localities. When requests for the weather content arise from respective end users, the local weather content may be delivered to the respective end users where the local weather content includes the data from at least one of the plurality of weather stations in the

locality associated with respect to requests from each end user clients. In this way, actual weather data from a particular locality is made available to an end user having an interest in the weather at that particular locality.

It is respectfully submitted that Schwoegler is directed to a different method entirely, and this difference has been emphasized by the amendment made to Claim 1. Schwoegler is directed to a “weather forecasting system”. In Schwoegler the system receives weather data from a particular vendor such as the National Weather Service, Doppler radar scans or other vendors (see, e.g., column 6, lines 7-10). This data is then provided to a “prediction processor 68” that creates weather forecast information at different time intervals (column 6, lines 21-25). When a user transmits a request from a particular location, forecast information is transmitted to the user (column 7, lines 45-49).

Comparing amended Claim 1 with Schwoegler, amended Claim 1 is directed to a method for collecting weather content continuously from a plurality of weather stations positioned in different localities. Schwoegler on the other hand receives weather information collected from a weather data vendor, and not continuously collected from a plurality of weather stations. Moreover, while Schwoegler may receive the weather data from the National Weather Service or Doppler radar scans, it does not continuously collect weather content from a plurality of weather stations positioned in different localities.

Claim 1 also requires selecting local weather content to be delivered to each end user in response to each request where the local weather content includes data from at least one of the plurality of weather stations in a locality associated with respect to requests from each end user client. In contrast, Schwoegler delivers forecast data for a particular area where the forecast was generated by a prediction processor 68 (see, e.g., column 6, lines 22-24). Accordingly, Claim 1 requires the local weather content to be from at least one of the plurality of weather stations, but in Schwoegler the data that is provided to an end user is

actually a forecast based on information processed by the prediction processor 68.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Schwoegler neither teaches nor suggests the collecting step or selecting step of amended Claim 1.

Densmore does not cure this deficiency with regard to amended Claim 1, as Densmore is merely asserted for its alleged disclosure of having client objects that periodically request downloads. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that no matter how Schwoegler is combined with Densmore, the combination neither teaches nor suggests all the elements of Claim 1.

Although of differing statutory class and/or scope, each of the other pending Claims 2-19 also patentably define over Schwoegler in view of Densmore for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-19, as amended, is definite and patentably distinguishing over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\BDL\252532US AWS WEATHERBUG\252532US-AM.DOC